DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA STATEHOOD CONSTITUTIONAL CONVENTION

- - -

Saturday, April 24, 1982

Washington, D.C.

The plenary session was convened at 12:50 p.m. in Convention Hall, 10th and E Streets, N.W., Washington, D.C., Mr. Charles Cassell, Chairman, presiding.

C O N T E N T S

	PAGE
Call Convention to Order	3
Meditation	3
Roll Call	3
Approval of Minutes	9
Announcements	9
Approval of Agenda	10
President's Report	10
Operating Committee Reports	
Style and Drafting - Delegate Corn	79
Rules and Calendar - Delegate Robinson	90
Address by the Honorable Arrington Dixon, Chairperson, D.C. City Council	136
Convention Secretary's Report	144

- - -

P R O C E E D I N G S

THE CHAIRMAN: I call the convention to order. There will be a moment of meditation.

(Whereupon, a short pause was taken.)

THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Secretary, would you call the roll please.

DELEGATE COOPER: Delegate Baldwin.

(No response.)

DELEGATE COOPER: Delegate Barnes.

(No response.)

DELEGATE COOPER: Delegate Blount.

DELEGATE BLOUNT: Present.

DELEGATE COOPER: Delegate Bruning.

(No response.)

DELEGATE COOPER: Delegate Cassell.

DELEGATE CASSELL: Present.

DELEGATE COOPER: Delegate Clark.

(No response.)

DELEGATE COOPER: Delegate Coates.

(No response.)

DELEGATE COOPER: Delegate Cooper; present.

Delegate Corn.

DELEGATE CORN: Present.

DELEGATE COOPER: Delegate Croft.

DELEGATE CROFT: Present.

DELEGATE COOPER: Delegate Eichhorn.

(No response.)

DELEGATE COOPER: Delegate Feely.

(No response.)

DELEGATE COOPER: Delegate Freeman.

DELEGATE FREEMAN: Here.

DELEGATE COOPER: Delegate Garner.

DELEGATE GARNER: Here.

DELEGATE COOPER: Delegate Graham.

DELEGATE GRAHAM: Here.

DELEGATE COOPER: Delegate Harris.

DELEGATE HARRIS: Here.

DELEGATE COOPER: Delegate Holmes.

(No response.)

DELEGATE COOPER: Delegate Jackson.

(No response.)

DELEGATE COOPER: Delegate Johnson.

DELEGATE JOHNSON: Here.

DELEGATE COOPER: Delegate Jones.

DELEGATE JONES: Here.

DELEGATE COOPER: Delegate Jordan.

(No response.)

DELEGATE COOPER: Delegate Kameny.

DELEGATE KAMENY: Here.

DELEGATE COOPER: Delegate Lockridge.

DELEGATE LOCKRIDGE: Here.

DELEGATE COOPER: Delegate Long.

(No response.)

DELEGATE COOPER: Delegate Love.

(No response.)

DELEGATE COOPER: Delegate Maguire.

(No response.)

DELEGATE COOPER: Delegate Marcus.

(No response.)

DELEGATE COOPER: Delegate Charles Mason.

DELEGATE CHARLES MASON: Here.

DELEGATE COOPER: Delegate Hilda Mason.

DELEGATE HILDA MASON: Here.

DELEGATE COOPER: Delegate Brian Moore.

DELEGATE BRIAN MOORE: Present.

DELEGATE COOPER: Delegate Jerry Moore.

(No response.)

DELEGATE COOPER: Delegate Talmadge Moore.

(No response.)

DELEGATE COOPER: Delegate Nihikian.

DELEGATE NIHIKIAN: Here.

DELEGATE COOPER: Delegate Nixon.

(No response.)

DELEGATE COOPER: Delegate Oulahan.

(No response.)

DELEGATE COOPER: Delegate Paramore.

DELEGATE PARAMORE: Here.

DELEGATE COOPER: Delegate Robinson.

DELEGATE ROBINSON: Here.

DELEGATE COOPER: Delegate Rothschild.

(No response.)

DELEGATE COOPER: Delegate Schrag.

DELEGATE SCHRAG: Here.

DELEGATE COOPER: Delegate Shelton.

(No response.)

DELEGATE COOPER: Delegate Simmons.

DELEGATE SIMMONS: Present.

DELEGATE COOPER: Delegate Street.

DELEGATE STREET: Here.

DELEGATE COOPER: Delegate Terrell.

DELEGATE TERRELL: Here.

DELEGATE COOPER: Delegate Thomas.

DELEGATE THOMAS: Here.

DELEGATE COOPER: Delegate Warren.

(No response.)

DELEGATE COOPER: Delegate Baldwin.

(No response.)

DELEGATE COOPER: Delegate Barnes.

(No response.)

DELEGATE COOPER: Delegate Bruning.

DELEGATE BRUNING: Here.

DELEGATE COOPER: Delegate Clark.

(No response.)

DELEGATE COOPER: Delegate Coates.

(No response.)

DELEGATE COOPER: Delegate Eichhorn.

(No response.)

DELEGATE COOPER: Delegate Feely.

DELEGATE FEELY: Present.

DELEGATE COOPER: Delegate Holmes.

DELEGATE HOLMES: Here.

DELEGATE COOPER: Delegate Jackson.

(No response.)

DELEGATE COOPER: Delegate Jordan.

(No response.)

DELEGATE COOPER: Delegate Long.

(No response.)

DELEGATE COOPER: Delegate Love.

(No response.)

DELEGATE COOPER: Delegate Maguire.

(No response.)

DELEGATE COOPER: Delegate Marcus.

(No response.)

DELEGATE COOPER: Delegate Talmadge Moore.

(No response.)

DELEGATE COOPER: Delegate Nixon.

(No response.)

DELEGATE COOPER: Delegate Oulahan.

(No response.)

DELEGATE COOPER: Delegate Rothschild.

(No response.)

DELEGATE COOPER: Delegate Shelton.

(No response.)

DELEGATE COOPER: Delegate Warren.

(No response.)

DELEGATE COOPER: Mr. President, there are 27 delegates present.

THE CHAIRMAN: There being 27 delegates present,

there is a quorum and we will now begin.

At this point, we would have had a speaker, the Honorable Arrington Dixon, Chairperson of the D.C. City Council. Until he gets here, we will go on with the agenda.

Do I hear a motion to approve the minutes.

DELEGATE BLOUNT: I so move, Mr. Chairman.

(Whereupon, the motion was seconded.)

THE CHAIRMAN: It has been moved and seconded that the minutes be approved. Are there any corrections?

(No response.)

THE CHAIRMAN: All those in favor of approving the minutes, signify by saying aye.

(A chorus of "ayes".)

THE CHAIRMAN: Those opposed.

(No response.)

THE CHAIRMAN: Abstain.

(No response.)

THE CHAIRMAN: The minutes are approved.

Are there any announcements? Does anybody have any announcements?

(No response.)

THE CHAIRMAN: Do I hear a motion to approve the agenda?

DELEGATE LOCKRIDGE: I so move, Mr. President.

(Whereupon, the motion was seconded.)

THE CHAIRMAN: It has been moved and seconded that we approve the agenda as written. Those in favor, signify by saying aye.

(A chorus of "ayes".)

THE CHAIRMAN: Those opposed.

(No response.)

THE CHAIRMAN: Abstain.

(No response.)

THE CHAIRMAN: The motion carries.

The President's Report, the Executive Committee Report: The convention has responded to the urgent pleas of the members to provide General Counsel. And we now have a General Counsel. That General Counsel has been working for us for the last two days. He was engaged on the 21st and he has been reviewing the proposals and the concept papers that have been given to him.

I would like to introduce to you now the gentleman who is our -- could we have everybody's attention? I want to introduce our counsel now. Mr. Ralph Thomas is a lawyer in private practice. He is highly recommended by another lawyer who comes highly recommended, Mr. Vincent Cohen, from

Washington, D.C. He is also a member of the Maryland Sanitary Suburban Commission and he has been working for us. May I introduce to you Mr. Ralph Thomas.

Mr. Thomas, is there anything you would like to say about what you have been doing and are doing that the delegates need to hear at the moment.

MR. THOMAS: I am reviewing the concept papers and the proposals that have been submitted to me thus far. One point of correction: I am a member of the Washington Sanitary Commission. I used to be on the task force of the committee, but getting back to this, any questions that you may have, please let me know.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. We have -- in fact, let me read to you the proposals that we have. We went over this in Executive Committee but I want everybody to know where we stand regarding proposals. We have draft proposals from the Legislative Committee and that has already been analyzed by Mr. Thomas and that analysis will be ready for that committee very shortly.

The Local Government draft proposal has been analyzed and will be given to that committee.

The Education Committee's concept paper has been analyzed and we have provided that to them.

The Suffrage proposal has been analyzed by him. The Economic Development -- he has given us a partial proposal. He has given that a preliminary review.

Finance and Taxation, he has given us a draft proposal and a preliminary review.

Preamble and Bill of Rights has a partial proposal and that is the preamble portion of their articles. That has not yet been reviewed. The Executive Branch proposal has not yet been reviewed. The Judicial, we do not have yet a proposal officially. I understand that the chairperson of that committee is circulating such document at this very moment.

Health, Housing and Social Services do not have a proposal yet.

Let me read to you what it is that we need as of this moment and express the importance of getting those today, if at all possible, inasmuch as our rules indicate that in order to read them, as we have to begin during next week, they should have been before the convention for 72 hours. So what is to be read on Monday should have been read three days prior to Monday, which means by Friday.

Okay. We need a proposal from the Education Committee. We need a proposal from Economic Development Committee, of

which we have a partial proposal. We need a proposal from the Preamble and Rights Committee; we only have a partial proposal. We need a proposal -- or we have a proposal from the Judicial Committee today and I assume that if it is being circulated -- I will assume since copies are being made. And we need a proposal from the Health, Housing and Social Services Committee.

Okay. We will get to this a little later about the ability of each of the committees to meet this schedule, based on their ability to get the proposals to the delegates according to the rules 72 hours prior. I think we are going to have to propose that we waive that rule and reduce some of that time, which means that those people who are scheduled to read, say, on Tuesday and have not yet gotten their proposals submitted to us, their draft proposals submitted to us, would be allowed to proceed on Tuesday if indeed they give it to the delegates at least 24 hours so that you have it at least and can read it over. The reason for that is we can't expand the time beyond May 29th. All we can do is to compress activities and one of the things we certainly can do is to make our rules flexible enough to let us do that without endangering the process. I wouldn't want any rule to come up to be read that nobody has seen. So there needs

to be some time but we may have to consider, based on who is ready, to compress some of those pre-reading times.

Proposed emergency legislation: You know that last time we passed out copies of proposed emergency legislation from the Corporation Counsel's office, from Arrington Dixon, and I don't know whether we passed out at that time Mrs. Mason's amendment to Arrington Dixon. Did we pass that out last week?

DELEGATE HARRIS: Yes. We put it in all the boxes.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. So everybody has seen them. There was also a proposal from the General Counsel for the Board of Elections suggesting to the City Council that they pass emergency legislation to allow specific time frames for the voting on the constitution and for the voting of the representatives to the Congress from the new state and a determination as to whether elections should be partisan or non-partisan.

The Executive Committee met on Wednesday and had a request from the Mayor regarding this proposal. The Mayor was going to prepare his response to the City Council. He wanted to know what the Executive Committee of the convention felt about those proposals.

We want to give to you now the reactions and responses

that we gave to him of the Executive Committee and give it to you for your information and your comments. If you read those proposals, you know that the Mayor's proposals suggested that there be an election or rather a referendum on the constitution at this November's election and at the same time consistent with the statehood initiative legislation that there be an election on two Senators and representatives. And that's what he proposed to us.

Our response to the Mayor after canvassing the Executive Committee members present and all the chairpersons, who were there for that meeting also, was that the consensus of the Executive Committee and chairpersons was that we would prefer to have the referendum on the constitution in November this year and the election of Senators and a representative at some time subsequent to that, not the following November but at a point between November 1982 and November 1983.

We also indicated that our preference was for partisan elections rather than non-partisan elections. Now how much weight that will carry with the Corporation Counsel's recommendation we don't know, but that is the position that the Executive Committee persons took.

Question?

DELEGATE HARRIS: Yes. Mr. President, is it important then that this body send a letter? Should this body send a letter to the Mayor transmitting officially the wisdom of the Executive Committee and the Chair and maybe even this body?

THE CHAIRMAN: Let's get that out of the way now. I will entertain that now and get it out of the way.

Is that a motion?

DELEGATE COOPER: We don't have a quorum.

THE CHAIRMAN: We do not.

DELEGATE HARRIS: When a quorum is here, may I make that a motion?

THE CHAIRMAN: If somebody gets one person in here, we can carry that motion. All right, we have it.

Okay.

DELEGATE HARRIS: Mr. President, I would like to move that a letter be sent to the Mayor or Corporation Counsel transmitting the thoughts of the Executive Committee and the chair of that committee of the three things you just stated regarding the constitution, the voting on the constitution, the senators and a representative on a non-partisan election.

(Whereupon, the motion was seconded.)

THE CHAIRMAN: Non-partisan?

DELEGATE HARRIS: Partisan election.

THE CHAIRMAN: It has been moved and seconded that the decision of the Executive Committee and the chairpersons as described be communicated by letter to the Mayor. Discussion?

Corn.

DELEGATE CORN: There was a sizable minority which objected to having a partisan election. I would like the letter to the Mayor to reflect that a sizable minority did not want a partisan election.

DELEGATE HARRIS: May I answer that? I have given the vote down for that meeting and on the motion of non-partisan election which was made by Delegate Corn and seconded by Delegate Blount, there were five for, eleven opposed. That is not a sizable number.

THE CHAIRMAN: Further discussion of this? Delegate Schrag.

DELEGATE SCHRAG: I think the Executive Committee's suggestion of moving the election away from the ratification vote is a very wise one, so that we don't get ratification of the constitution and statehood mixed up with the individual political context. But I wonder about the question of having

an election in between November and November. Will we run into questions -- will we run into a flak based on the cost of holding a special election and would it be better -- Mr. Chairman, I wonder whether it would be better for the convention to take no position on when that second election was to avoid being accused of charging the voters with an extra bill for holding a separate election?

THE CHAIRMAN: Let me ask the question of those who were there -- that there be a special election some time subsequent to that time for Senators and a representative.

DELEGATE SIMMONS: Would you pick out alternatives, one, that refers to what position the committee chairs and the Executive Committee are on the constitution being submitted September/ November?

THE CHAIRMAN: This November.

DELEGATE SIMMONS: This November. Two, that the election be partisan or non-partisan and the majority vote was partisan. Is that correct?

THE CHAIRMAN: Right.

DELEGATE SIMMONS: And three, that the election of those Congressional representatives be --

THE CHAIRMAN: Some time subsequent.

DELEGATE SIMMONS: November of 1983? That means it

could be November 1983?

THE CHAIRMAN: Let me ask Delegate Blount who made that motion to repeat that motion.

DELEGATE BLOUNT: The motion was that special election could be held January, February, March, April.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay, fine.

DELEGATE SIMMONS: Mr. President, with that clarification, it would seem to me that these three are sufficiently substantive, that they should not be embodied in a single motion unless you are willing to deal with them a seriatim because I think because one wants to vote one point does not mean that one wants to vote affirmatively on all three.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. Mr. Thomas.

DELEGATE THOMAS: Mr. President, I would like the record to show very clearly that there were five people in the committee who thought that should be a partisan election -- a non-partisan election. As a representative of 1,000 of government employees in the City of Washington, D.C. who is affected by the Hatch Act, I want the record to show very clearly that had not the elections for statehood constitutional convention been non-partisan, then today I would not have had an opportunity to participate in this whole process.

And I would like for the record to show that very clearly.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. Delegate Brian Moore.

DELEGATE BRIAN MOORE: I pass.

THE CHAIRMAN: Delegate Garner.

DELEGATE GARNER: Mr. Chairman, the motion on the floor is that we send a letter describing what happened in the Executive Committee. If that is in fact both the intent and the image in which it's portrayed, fine, I will vote for this motion. If you're asking us to support the substance of what the Executive Committee proposed, then I will vote against. What am I voting for -- a letter describing what the Executive Committee did or the substance of what the Executive Committee did?

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, I don't think he is really is interested in just procedure on that; he is interested in the substance. He wants to know what our views are.

DELEGATE GARNER: Given that, can we ask the maker of the motion to make the motion in the form of the convention supports the following position -- whatever it is, partisan elections, at a different time, and make that the motion on the floor, not whether we should send a letter describing the Executive Committee's actions?

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes. Delegate Harris, two people

asked for revisions of that. Do you want to make that motion?

DELEGATE HARRIS: I would reply to alter that motion and state that the convention supports, one, that the constitution be presented for vote by the voters in November.

DELEGATE SIMMONS: I second that motion.

THE CHAIRMAN: It has been moved and seconded that the constitution -- that the convention include in its letter to the Mayor its support for holding a referendum on the constitution in November. Any discussion on that?

Delegate Kameny.

DELEGATE KAMENY: I merely would like to inquire -- at this point I'm undecided -- what are the considerations, what are the concerns as you see them which weigh pro and con between September and November? I ask for information.

THE CHAIRMAN: The delegates felt that there should be an election consistent with the statehood initiative, which said that there shall be an election. Since it was not specific as to when, the delegates felt that that should be in the next election, so the next election which will likely to get approval and November was that particular one.

DELEGATE KAMENY: No. We have an election in September and I'm asking why you made it November rather than

in the regular -- we have a major election here in September and I am inquiring as to why you chose November.

THE CHAIRMAN: The delegates thought that we would have the best for asking for November.

Delegate Maguire.

DELEGATE MAGUIRE: I would just like to make one point to the delegate and I go back to the Congressional hearings on the initiative. And one of the things that the District Committee members kept pointing to us is that, although the initiative passed, it didn't pass on that wider margin in that kind or mode of election. And then in ratification on the Hill, it's going to look much better if we have a very high voter turnout. That's what they said to us before the Hill and that's what they say to us again.

I don't believe that we are going to be any more organized or prepared in November to get people to ratify than we are in September. We have to just move ahead, get it ratified in September. We need the numbers. It's going to help us on the Hill.

If we say we won in November with 55 percent of voting, that wouldn't mean anything. If we say that we won by 60 percent in September with a large turnout, it's going to mean a lot more.

THE CHAIRMAN: Before I recognize the next person, I want to say what we are reporting is a consensus, a consensus which is reflected in the vote at that time.

Delegate Corn.

DELEGATE CORN: Mr. Chairman, I would like to say that I would agree with voting for the September date. The reason I say that is as follows: Number one, there will be a higher amount of turnout in the primaries; number two, in the November elections, especially in Ward 3, the conservative Republican Party will turn out more votes than it will in the primary season because they're going to try to win the Ward 3 seat.

Therefore, if you really want this constitution passed, regardless of what I may personally feel, you should get this out in the September election. You're more likely to have a larger number of Democrats voting then and those Democrats are more likely to vote it up and Republicans are more likely to vote it down. It's that simple.

THE CHAIRMAN: Delegate Jordan.

DELEGATE JORDAN: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I have to rise to support the position I just heard articulated by both Barbara Maguire and Delegate Corn.

When I analyze the voting turnout in the primaries

and that which follows in the subsequent general election, the history of the city is that we have a higher turnout in the primary elections. Now I have shared a concern that -- I mean it's just simple for us to look at the numbers of voters who supported statehood and those who didn't. It was 90,000/60,000. So I mean we didn't have an overwhelming majority of the people in this city say that they wanted statehood. I mean we have to accept that as a given.

So the question is: How do we get the greatest number of voters to support or at least to indicate support for this statehood constitution. And I think there are several factors that we need to consider: one is that there is going to be a Democratic primary. This primary is going to elicit a tremendous amount of interest among the voters in this city and it is going to create a high turnout of Democrats.

The second thing is I think that those Democrats have a greater proclivity toward voting for statehood than will the Republicans in this city. So I want to capture those voters. I don't think we're going to have the votes in November to match what we will have in September.

So, Mr. Chairman, I would think that in all due respect to the vote that is taken by those who did vote

earlier, I would urge my fellow delegates to vote for the election in September, because I think that we will have a higher number of voters at that point.

DELEGATE CORN: Could you make that a motion?

(Simultaneous discussion.)

THE CHAIRMAN: We have a motion on the floor now.

DELEGATE JORDAN: I'm speaking against the motion that has been offered, that is that we vote to have the election in November (sic).

DELEGATE CORN: September.

DELEGATE JORDAN: I mean I can understand some underlying reasons for wanting to do it. I'm not persuaded by the proposal. One of the reasons is that we would have more voters who will come out to vote in September than we will in November.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. Delegate Corn, may I ask you please, do not be out of order again.

Let me point out that one of the reasons that the delegates -- this is a point of information for you -- were persuaded to vote as they did is that one of our members who is an office holder in the City Council was not certain that a large turnout would necessarily help. And it was his feeling that it may be that a small turnout would not necessarily

damage our cause. That was just a personal opinion.

Talmadge Moore, Brian Moore, Blount.

DELEGATE TALMADGE MOORE: Mr. Chairman, I would like to make a substitute motion. I would like to have the constitution presented to the voters in September.

(Whereupon, the motion was seconded.)

THE CHAIRMAN: There is a substitute motion that the election regarding the constitution should be held in the September primary.

Brian Moore.

DELEGATE BRIAN MOORE: Point of information. What initiatives will be before the voters and will it be in the primaries or the general?

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes. Is there somebody who could rattle those out for us? Delegate Nihikian.

DELEGATE NIHIKIAN: My understanding is that there is one initiative sure and possibly a second initiative, the first one being the mandatory sentencing for guns; the second being the nuclear freeze resolution which will both be on the ballots at the general election in November.

THE CHAIRMAN: I sense that your question was what initiatives would be on the September ballot.

DELEGATE BRIAN MOORE: Either way. I just wanted to

know. They may attract a large turnout whenever the election is.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay, further discussion on the motion. Delegate Corn.

DELEGATE HARRIS: No, Blount was next.

THE CHAIRMAN: I'm sorry. Delegate Blount.

DELEGATE BLOUNT: I just wanted to raise a few points to the delegates in opposition to the September substitute motion. The first thing is we're not sure what the time span is -- will be needed. Given the work of the Board of Elections, I would think that the September election would be better for them.

The other thing is that some people don't want to speak about silly things, but I think this should be brought out that many of us will be supporting mayoral candidates, and I'm not sure who is going to have the time to give the statehood the effort that is needed to the September primary.

The other issue is that in November it may be that the issue will have a higher capability once the mayoral election is over because you won't have to deal with the Democratic legislation slot for the Democratic mayor to win.

The other thing is that the type of constitution that we write I think will vary a great deal as to whether or not it will be passed for the September or November. If we have a radical constitution, as has been written in the editorial this morning, I'm sure we're going to have more opposition.

So I just wanted to bring those points to your attention and if you think objectively, I think you should vote for the motion that the election be held in November.

THE CHAIRMAN: Corn, Jordan, Thomas, Nihikian, Simmons.

DELEGATE CORN: In addition to the points that I have already made regarding probable partisan influence on the voting up or down of this constitution, I would also like to raise two other points. The first one Brian Moore inadvertently pointed out. When you have other initiatives on the ballot, for initiative on referendum, it is possible that some of the issues may become confused to some voters. This way all they are going to be voting on is this one candidate and this one issue.

Third of all, once the primary is over and the candidate from each party has won, then we take various positions one way or another, vote this document up or down.

And if the Democratic primary winner decides he or she does not like this document, he could destroy it in the November elections, whereas in September you've got an even and fair shot. And none of the candidates for either party will be working on getting this document put down because they will all be working on their own elections.

I urge you to vote for the September date.

THE CHAIRMAN: Delegate Jordan.

DELEGATE JORDAN: Yes. I think if we want to be objective about it, we will first examine the fact that we have more voters who will turn out in the September election than we have in the November election. That's being objective.

The second point I want to make is that I know that we are talking about politicizing, but it's politicized anyway. There is no way for us to avoid it. There are too many of us in here who have taken sides for one candidate or the other. I think one of the things that it does in this upcoming September primaries will force some candidates to take a position on statehood one way or the other. And I think that's helping.

I think that if you look to November, we will have gotten by. There will be some people who will have skated

through it and never had to make a commitment to statehood or anything else. I think any candidate who is running in September ought to be willing to take a firm stand on the side of statehood.

(Applause.)

DELEGATE JORDAN: I don't think we can get those kind of commitments from individuals unless it's going to be a factor at the time when they are going to be elected. And I think if we wait until November, we're going to lose some votes, who may want to vacillate who are in support of statehood anyway or get lukewarm to it.

So I think it's to the advantage of those of us who have labored so hard up to this half-way point for statehood, put a lot of time and effort into this document, that we are going to be submitting to the voter, that we get as much support and we have as much voters come out as possible. And I'm just saying we're not going to have that in November. I mean it's just that clear.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. We have more than two for and two against. I will take two more, Thomas and Harris.

DELEGATE THOMAS: Mr. Chairman, I would like to support the position of Miss Maguire, Mr. Jordan and Miss Corn that it should be a must that we take this constitution

to the people in September. In September there will only be one initiative on the ballot, that's the statehood. In November there will be two more, which will confuse the voters that much more.

So it's my pleasure to stand up for the September date.

DELEGATE HARRIS: I would like to speak against that. And I thought I would bring out a couple of points that were mentioned in the Executive Committee, one by Delegate Jerry Moore, that might be of interest to you, and that is he said that the constitution may have a better chance at approval in November because the "larger turnout", quote/ unquote, in September might overshadow the move towards getting the constitution approved. And we all know that there will be a large mayoral race come September and that might overshadow the whole thought of getting the constitution approved.

So I'm asking that you support the November election rather than the September.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. I'm going to call for a vote on it now. Those in favor of the substitute motion, and that is that the constitution be voted on in September, signify by saying aye.

(A chorus of "ayes".)

THE CHAIRMAN: Those opposed.

(A chorus of "nays".)

THE CHAIRMAN: Abstain.

(No response.)

THE CHAIRMAN: All right, roll call.

Those in favor of the substitute motion to have the Mayor know that this convention supports September for the voting of the constitution, signify by raising your hand.

VOICES: Roll call.

THE CHAIRMAN: You really want a roll call?

Mr. Secretary.

If you are in favor of the convention expressing its desire that the vote on the constitution be held in September, signify by saying yes. If you are opposed, say no.

Mr. Secretary.

DELEGATE SIMMONS: Point of information.

Mr. President, could you please tell me why it is that we have to tell the Mayor anything. I think it's important for us to know where this body is and, you know, if he asked you, then fine. But I don't see where this body has any -- the Mayor doesn't create legislation, the City Council does.

THE CHAIRMAN: That's your point of order?

DELEGATE SIMMONS: No, I raise a point of information.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, anything the Mayor asks us is germane to what we are going to do and he deserves an answer. I have a problem responding as to how we feel.

Roll call please.

DELEGATE COOPER: Delegate Barnes.

(No response.)

DELEGATE COOPER: Delegate Blount.

DELEGATE BLOUNT: No.

DELEGATE COOPER: Delegate Bruning.

DELEGATE BRUNING: Yes.

DELEGATE COOPER: Delegate Clark.

(No response.)

DELEGATE COOPER: Delegate Coates.

DELEGATE COATES: Yes.

DELEGATE COOPER: Delegate Cooper; yes.

Delegate Corn.

DELEGATE CORN: Yes.

DELEGATE COOPER: Delegate Eichhorn.

(No response.)

DELEGATE COOPER: Delegate Croft.

DELEGATE CROFT: Yes.

DELEGATE COOPER: Delegate Feely.

DELEGATE FEELY: Yes.

DELEGATE COOPER: Delegate Freeman.

DELEGATE FREEMAN: Yes.

DELEGATE COOPER: Delegate Garner.

DELEGATE GARNER: No.

DELEGATE COOPER: Delegate Graham.

DELEGATE GRAHAM: Yes.

DELEGATE COOPER: Delegate Harris.

DELEGATE HARRIS: No.

DELEGATE COOPER: Delegate Holmes.

DELEGATE HOLMES: Yes.

DELEGATE COOPER: Delegate Jackson.

(No response.)

DELEGATE COOPER: Delegate Johnson.

DELEGATE JOHNSON: Yes.

DELEGATE COOPER: Delegate Jones.

DELEGATE JONES: Yes.

DELEGATE COOPER: Delegate Jordan.

DELEGATE JORDAN: Yes.

DELEGATE COOPER: Delegate Kameny.

DELEGATE KAMENY: Yes.

DELEGATE COOPER: Delegate Lockridge.

DELEGATE LOCKRIDGE: No.

DELEGATE COOPER: Delegate Long.

(No response.)

DELEGATE COOPER: Delegate Love.

(No response.)

DELEGATE COOPER: Delegate Maguire.

DELEGATE MAGUIRE: Yes.

DELEGATE COOPER: Delegate Marcus.

(No response.)

DELEGATE COOPER: Delegate Charles Mason.

DELEGATE CHARLES MASON: Yes.

DELEGATE COOPER: Delegate Hilda Mason.

DELEGATE HILDA MASON: Yes.

DELEGATE COOPER: Delegate Brian Moore.

DELEGATE BRIAN MOORE: Yes.

DELEGATE COOPER: Delegate Jerry Moore.

(No response.)

DELEGATE COOPER: Delegate Talmadge Moore.

DELEGATE TALMADGE MOORE: Yes.

DELEGATE COOPER: Delegate Nihikian.

DELEGATE NIHIKIAN: Yes.

DELEGATE COOPER: Delegate Nixon.

DELEGATE NIXON: Yes.

DELEGATE COOPER: Delegate Oulahan.

DELEGATE OULAHAN: No.

DELEGATE COOPER: Delegate Paramore.

DELEGATE PARAMORE: No.

DELEGATE COOPER: Delegate Robinson.

DELEGATE ROBINSON: Yes.

DELEGATE COOPER: Delegate Rothschild.

DELEGATE ROTHSCHILD: Abstain.

DELEGATE COOPER: Delegate Schrag.

DELEGATE SCHRAG: Yes.

DELEGATE COOPER: Delegate Shelton.

(No response.)

DELEGATE COOPER: Delegate Simmons.

DELEGATE SIMMONS: Yes.

DELEGATE COOPER: Delegate Street.

(No response.)

DELEGATE COOPER: Delegate Terrell.

DELEGATE TERRELL: Yes.

DELEGATE COOPER: Delegate Thomas.

DELEGATE THOMAS: Yes.

DELEGATE COOPER: Delegate Warren.

DELEGATE WARREN: Yes.

DELEGATE COOPER: Delegate Baldwin.

(No response.)

DELEGATE COOPER: Delegate Cassell.

DELEGATE CASSELL: No.

DELEGATE COOPER: Mr. President, 25 in favor of the substitute motion; 7 not in favor and one abstention.

THE CHAIRMAN: There were 25 in favor, 7 not in favor and one abstention; the substitute motion carries.

(Applause.)

THE CHAIRMAN: The next part of that motion. Do I hear a motion with regard to the election of state representatives to the -- or rather representatives to the United States Congress?

DELEGATE JORDAN: Mr. Chairman, I didn't hear that motion.

DELEGATE HARRIS: The second part of that is I move that the special election be held some time later for Senators and a representative.

THE CHAIRMAN: There was a second. It was moved and seconded that the state representatives be elected at the same time in November.

(Simultaneous discussion.)

DELEGATE HARRIS: Some time later.

THE CHAIRMAN: At a time subsequent to the November election.

Delegate Simmons, Blount.

DELEGATE SIMMONS: I would like to know if I could make a substitute motion? I would like to substitute that the Congressional representatives be elected in November 1982.

DELEGATE KAMENY: Second.

THE CHAIRMAN: It has been moved and seconded -- there is a substitute motion that the Congressional representatives be elected in November 1982. Does anyone want to speak to the motion?

DELEGATE SIMMONS: I would like to speak to the motion. I shared this with the Executive Committee -- with the steering committee and the chair and I think that since we don't have minutes for those, I will just say it broadly that I would simply like to make it a matter of record in terms of that position again.

I believe that persons who serve as delegates to this body have an obligation to maintain the integrity of that initiative that they consider it good enough to run on and become delegates. That initiative had made very clearly in its body of 1979 what the procedure would be, that

process was to be, at a time so that the constitution and the representatives would simultaneously be before the public and, at the same time, have the opportunity to work for a year. So there was a fairly specific rationale and reason for having those persons. That's not some kind of decoration. That is the substance of constructive work to lobby and work in a maximally successful -- you know, high success guaranteed environment for those people with regard to the constitution on the Hill, since that's the aim, that's the purpose, that's the obligation of those representatives. It seems to me that we ought to have them ready to go to work simultaneous with the passage of the constitution.

And I think for us to suddenly impose our wisdom upon the initiative that we weren't in fact imposing pre-November 1981 when we ran, we thought that that was a good enough document for us to put our names on there in attempt to become delegates to do this mode of work, I would like for us to demonstrate that consistent respectfulness for the integrity of that initiative and see that it's consummated in its entirety.

And I will be supporting the substitute and I, also while I am on my feet, want to commend this body for the support of the substitute motion because it's that act that

now makes this substitute motion possible.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay, thank you. Delegate Blount.

Before you speak, let me say that we made good time last week. By 2:00 we were practically finished with our agenda. I'm going to try to limit this,unless people demand to speak, to two for and two against according to our rules.

Delegate Blount.

DELEGATE BLOUNT: Yes. I just wanted to point out that as I understand it many persons of expertise, including the Corporation Counsel, are saying that it's almost impossible to pull that off. So, you know, if they could do it, fine, but that's my understanding.

THE CHAIRMAN: Delegate Blount, I can't hear you and there may be others on the other side of the room. Would you be good enough to come to the front and raise your voice.

DELEGATE BLOUNT: We heard from the Corporation Counsel and other persons who have expertise with the election and they were saying that it's almost impossible to have that election in November. So that was why I moved that we would have a special election that would take place some time January, February or March.

Also the point was raised that there are many other issues that would be held during November and September.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay, that's one for and one against.

Delegate Maguire.

DELEGATE ROTHSCHILD: Point of order.

THE CHAIRMAN: Point of order.

DELEGATE ROTHSCHILD: Our rules are not limited to taking two for and two against. That is up to the body, the delegates themselves to decide. That should not be an arbitrary decision by the chair. That's a minimum, two for and two against; it's not a maximum.

THE CHAIRMAN: Delegate Maguire.

DELEGATE MAGUIRE: I would like to speak in favor of the substitute motion. If we're talking about expertise of running elections, I don't think that we could look to the Corporation Counsel or the D.C. Board of Elections for anything.

As far as the time lag, I think people will know that they are running in November before September and they will have plenty of time to organize their campaign and in addition it would be helpful in the ratification effort of September to have those people running, that they could also work for ratification, because if we don't ratify in September, there wouldn't be election in November. So those people would have to be also working for ratification in

September. I think we are really making a very unwise decision if we leave that language "at some other time". I mean we should know that anybody that wants to stop the statehood movement -- and I believe there are quite a few people who said they would like to stop the statehood movement -- "some other time" could be 1992.

THE CHAIRMAN: Delegate Schrag.

DELEGATE SCHRAG: Mr. Chairman, the problem is that people vote against constitutions for a variety of reasons. The constitutions pick up a rolling vote against them. Some people don't like one clause; some people don't like another clause.

If we have people running for a November election in a September primary for that election, for U.S. Senator and representative, at the same time that this constitution is on the ballot, then we're just adding one more reason for some people to vote against our constitution and vote against statehood. If voter doesn't like a lot of candidates that's running can say one way to keep those people out of office is just to vote against this constitution; there will be no office to elect them to. So that's an additional, cumulative reason for keeping the vote against the constitution.

I, therefore, move to amend the substitute to substitute the year 1983 for the year 1982.

(Whereupon, the motion was seconded.)

THE CHAIRMAN: It has been moved and seconded to amend the substitute motion to substitute the year 1983 for 1982. Discussion?

(Simultaneous discussion.)

DELEGATE SIMMONS: Delegate Schrag's motion is out of order. He gave a speech first and then he gave a motion.

THE CHAIRMAN: Delegate Charles Mason.

DELEGATE CHARLES MASON: It is my understanding that a majority of us agree that this election should be partisan, that is that people should run on party, on the basis of party membership. That means a primary and an election approximately two months apart whenever we have it.

Now it costs money to have a special election. I'm sure we do not want to wait until 1984 to piggyback on the primary and the general election then. So I would assume that we would -- I would favor the 1983 suggestion. Then we would get one election that wouldn't cost anything and we would have to pay for the primary in September because in odd years there normally isn't a primary, but we wouldn't have to pay for two, which we would have to do if we had it

in the summer or in the spring or some other time. It would be extra cost only for the primary and no extra cost for the general election.

And for that reason I would support the Schrag proposal, which is consistent with the Dixon bill and Hilda's amendment and so forth with regard to that election. But it seems to me that to have to pay for two special elections, the primary and the regular one at an unaccustomed time when there is no election, would not be good and also that two of them at an odd time of year may not bring out very many voters.

THE CHAIRMAN: Brian Moore.

DELEGATE BRIAN MOORE: Just a question, Mr. President: If we have elections, primary elections next spring in 1983, and the election in the fall of 1983, is there a possibility that Congress could not approve a statehood ad infinitum? In other words, if we elect -- if the voters approve the constitution this fall, but Congress never addresses the issue before we vote in favor of Congressional representatives, we may have Congressional representatives being paid by the District but not really participating in Congress until the Congress approves it and they may not approve it for two, three, four, five, ten years. And I'm wondering of the

wisdom of delaying elections until after Congress approves of our statehood.

THE CHAIRMAN: First of all, I don't know if there is any provision for paying those persons who are elected. I don't know of any initiative that requires they be paid. There would have to be special legislation for that.

Secondly, I don't know as the Congress is really going to be concerned about any of the procedures that our own government takes regarding their taking action. It's just a personal opinion.

Let me ask the delegates: You know, we really need to move on. Unless there is a whole lot of additional stuff, let us take one more and then move on.

Delegate Nihikian.

DELEGATE NIHIKIAN: I think that in the context of this debate there are two or three issues that I think the convention and the delegates to the convention need to be very sensitive to. I think that the issue of educating this community about what this constitution contains and in fact the even harder job of educating the community about how in fact their lives would be impacted by what we propose in the constitution is a mammoth job. And I think it's one that we haven't given too much thought to because we have been

very involved in this process.

People generally are very afraid of change, particularly dramatic change and the constitution, even if it is a very conservative constitution,will mean dramatic change in the lives of people in this community.

I think that that education process is best done in a non-personality electoral process. The point being that by delaying the election of representatives a la under the Schrag proposal that we will be in a better position to try to educate the community without getting them caught up in this clash that always happens around personality. And I just think that the delegates here have experienced some lessons along those lines. We all understood what was the difficulty of making decisions about leadership when we had to concentrate on issues of personality, whereas once we got to the committee structure and began dealing with issues our jobs became a whole lot different and a whole lot harder in fact because we had to wrestle with substantive issues.

I think we have to responsibly understand that the hardest job we have facing us as delegates and the biggest responsibility is to reassure our community that what we are proposing is in fact going to make their lives better. Unless we can do that, then we will not have a positive vote

for statehood.

So I urge support of the Schrag proposal.

THE CHAIRMAN: The Schrag amendment to the substitute motion is that the time be changed from November 1982 to November 1983 of the election of representatives from the new state to the Congress. Those in favor of that, signify by raising their hands.

(Show of hands.)

DELEGATE COOPER: Twenty-two.

THE CHAIRMAN: Those opposed.

(Show of hands.)

DELEGATE COOPER: Six.

THE CHAIRMAN: Those abstained.

(Show of hands.)

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay, the motion carries 22 to 6.

Now the third part of the issue.

DELEGATE HARRIS: The third part of the issue, I would move that this election be a partisan election.

(Whereupon, the motion was seconded.)

THE CHAIRMAN: It has been moved and seconded that the election of our Senators and representative be a partisan election. Any discussion?

Chestie Graham.

DELEGATE GRAHAM: Chestie Graham from Ward 6.

I go along with the idea of partisan at times but when it comes to this particular thing, I think we should look at it very carefully. And if we make a decision now, we should certainly be aware of the fact that we want all people to help pass the constitution.

It is for that reason, I think, we need to start off for these lobbyists to be from any particular party. As I see it, we should have instead of partisan a non-partisan election. And I'm speaking for that kind of thing. Would I have to make a motion, a substitute motion?

I'll just vote against it.

THE CHAIRMAN: Delegate Corn, Delegate Kameny.

DELEGATE CORN: I would strongly urge you to vote against a partisan election and I'll tell you why. First of all, as Harry Thomas pointed out, many of you would not be here had this been a partisan election. No government worker would either be able to run or would be able to help on the campaign of those who are running because government workers, federal and district, are hatched. That's number one.

Number two, if you have a partisan election, that means that there will be a special primary. It will cost the

District Government between $240,000 and $260,000 to hold that primary. I can think of many other needs in this city to spend $240,000 or $260,000 on than a primary. When I look around this city and I see the kind of poverty there is -- people without roofs and without food -- I can't think that a primary is that important.

And third of all, and equally important, if you have a partisan election, be absolutely assured that it will probably be three Democrats or two Democrats and an Independent who will win. You will most assuredly not get any Republican. That would be a tremendous mistake.

THE CHAIRMAN: Delegate Corn, that really isn't speaking to the motion.

DELEGATE CORN: It is speaking to the motion, sir.

THE CHAIRMAN: I rule that that is out of order. Now you finish your time. How much time does she have?

DELEGATE COOPER: She has a full five minutes.

THE CHAIRMAN: How much time does she have left?

DELEGATE COOPER: She has three-and-a-half minutes left.

DELEGATE CORN: All right.

I would say this: It's very important that a Republican get elected and the only way a Republican is going

to get elected is through a non-partisan process. You have a Republican President --

(Simultaneous discussion.)

DELEGATE CORN: I am speaking to the motion. I, therefore, am going to make a substitute motion that the election be non-partisan.

(Whereupon, the motion was seconded.)

THE CHAIRMAN: All right. Delegate Kameny.

DELEGATE CORN: Sir, I made a motion and it has been seconded that the election be non-partisan.

DELEGATE KAMENY: Delegate Kameny, Ward 3.

THE CHAIRMAN: Delegate Kameny, Delegate Corn says that she made a substitute motion.

(Simultaneous discussion.)

DELEGATE HARRIS: She can't do them both.

DELEGATE COOPER: Schrag did them both and we voted on it. So why can't Corn do it?

DELEGATE FREEMAN: There is nothing in the rules that says you can't do both.

THE CHAIRMAN: There is a substitute motion on the floor. Was there a second?

DELEGATE CORN: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: I didn't hear that motion. Would you

repeat that motion?

DELEGATE CORN: The motion is that elections be non-partisan.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. It has been moved and seconded in a substitute motion that the elections be non-partisan. Delegate Kameny, would you like to speak to that?

DELEGATE KAMENY: Yes, I would.

DELEGATE FEELY: Point of information.

Mr. Chairman, what effect would a non-partisan election have on the future of elections for members of the legislature?

THE CHAIRMAN: I don't know whether the Chair wants to respond to that. Let the Vice President respond to that.

DELEGATE HARRIS: There were several points brought out in the meeting that I thought were important. Number one is at an Executive Committee meeting one point that was brought out is that there is no space right now in Congress for non-partisan Senators or representatives. It was brought out that our non-voting delegate, Walter Fauntroy, is having a heck of a time getting things through as a delegate. It was also brought out that he represents the Democratic Party although he is non-partisan.

THE CHAIRMAN: Delegate Kameny please.

DELEGATE KAMENY: Thank you.

I rise to speak in favor of non-partisan elections. First of all, our senators and representatives are not going to have any particular status in Congress. They are going to be there to move forward on trying to get Congress to approve statehood. They don't have the kind of status that Delegate Fauntroy has even in a limited sense. They are there only a very narrow basis because we are choosing to send somebody up there who has the imprimatur of the people of the District but nothing more than that. They do not have the imprimatur of Congress in any case.

Given that we have to persuade large numbers of Congress people, many of whom are Republicans -- in fact, the majority in one house -- I think we will do far better, keeping in mind that the purpose of those elected people is to get statehood and nothing else, not to participate in the Congressional legislative process -- I think we will do far better to have people who are non-partisan.

One of the problems in any case with statehood, as we know, is going to be the feeling that by Republicans is that the District of Columbia is Democratic, the present District of Columbia is Democratic and they don't want to add more Democrats. I think that at least to a slight degree

that will be tempered by having people elected for this election -- now obviously once we are a state, that's a totally different matter -- but for this election and for this purpose, which is the furthering of statehood and not only having people who are non-partisan. And, therefore, I urge that we vote in favor of the substitute motion for non-partisan election.

Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Delegate Blount, point of information.

DELEGATE BLOUNT: I would like to move the question to the delegates, to the chair. What would happen -- what will happen after the Congress passes the constitution? Will we then have another partisan election or will we in some manner put a label on those neuters, as Delegate Simmons says?

DELEGATE KAMENY: I would assume that we would. Keep in mind that --

DELEGATE BLOUNT: You would assume, but do you have the information?

DELEGATE KAMENY: Even if we elect a young man, he may be dead by the time we get statehood. I think it's obvious that we are going to have to.

DELEGATE BLOUNT: You don't have an answer to the

question.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay, Delegate Blount, Robinson, Oulahan -- okay, Robinson, Oulahan, Thomas, Moore. Before you begin, we have Delegate Robinson, Oulahan, Thomas, Moore. Could we please move the agenda after those speakers?

Delegate Mason. After Delegate Mason, could we move the agenda? All right, one more, Simmons and that means that we have eight speakers and then we will vote.

Delegate Robinson.

DELEGATE ROBINSON: The question of partisan versus non-partisan election of the two Senators -- can't hear me?

The question of whether or not the convention will support the election of non-partisan or partisan Senators and representative to the Congress would be to the advantage of this convention to vote for non-partisan. I think that all of us here are victims of the Hatch Act and it is only through the vehicle of non-partisan elections that we were able to in fact run for the office of delegate to the constitutional convention.

My other point is it has been said or it was said at the Executive Committee meeting that Congress would not recognize a neuter, the fact being that persons who ran on a non-partisan basis would not be identified with one of

the major political parties. I say to you that the prime responsibility of the two Senators and the representative will be to lobby that document through the Congress, through the halls of the Congress. And I ask you: Is it necessary to be labeled as a Republican or as a Democrat to effectively lobby this constitution that we will draft through the halls of the Congress?

In closing I ask you in the name of all of those Government employees and other hatched persons to vote for a non-partisan election of Senators and representatives to the Congress.

THE CHAIRMAN: Delegate Oulahan.

DELEGATE OULAHAN: Mr. Chairman, the best argument that I have heard for Delegate Corn's substitute is the one that Delegate Robinson just made and I am sympathetic towards it. However, as a realistic matter, I think that a non-partisan election concerning this constitution is an absolute impossibility. It's going to become a partisan, non-partisan campaign no matter what we do.

Nine or ten months ago I would have agreed with Delegate Corn and would have liked to have seen a non-partisan election, but I don't think it's possible and, I might add, I recollect that my own political party, the Republican Party,

took that position in their testimony to the convention. So I oppose the substitute.

Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Delegate Thomas.

DELEGATE THOMAS: Mr. Chairman, first I would like to make a quote from the Freelance Star of Fredericksburg, Virginia, Wednesday, April the 14th, of an article written by the Associated Press writer, Michael Markweiss (Phonetic) and he was quoting Harry Thomas.

(Laughter.)

DELEGATE THOMAS: And it said: "I have never had the right to express myself living like the rest of the country" -- same as Harry Thomas. And I am speaking for a non-partisan election because I, as a Government employee, with the Hatch Act over my head, I couldn't have been here today had it been a partisan election. So for that reason, I want to vote in favor of a non-partisan election because statehood needs people like me to work for the passing of this constitution. So I vote for a non-partisan election.

DELEGATE TALMADGE MOORE: Point of information is: Would our stature be belittled if we're on the Hill as non-partisan representatives of the statehood?

THE CHAIRMAN: No.

DELEGATE TALMADGE MOORE: I just wanted to know that. Also how are the primary --

THE CHAIRMAN: Would you repeat that first part?

DELEGATE TALMADGE MOORE: Well, in essence, I just wanted to know what type of prestige would our Senators and representative have on the Hill if we went there and it was not identified with a specific party when all the Congressmen are identified with a party. And I believe it is the duty of the Congress to seat you. And I was wondering how they would seat representatives and Senators from the District of Columbia.

So I favor the partisan.

THE CHAIRMAN: I don't want to express a personal opinion here.

The next speaker is Delegate Mason.

DELEGATE CHARLES MASON: The election of what is known as Tennessee plan Congress people has really two principles. One is that these people will go to the Hill and lobby to get the new state admitted, but the second purpose is that they are there ready to take the seats as soon as we are admitted. So I think they should be chosen on the same basis that members of Congress from other states are chosen, which with one possible exception,is on the

partisan basis.

The committee chairs, for instance, go according to the party of the Senator, of House member and so on. There are seven states which elected Tennessee Plan Congress people, that is elected their Congress people prior to admission. The earliest one was Tennessee; the most recent was Alaska. And in most instances these people who were elected eventually became voting members of the Congress.

It seems to me that, in order that our people when we are admitted -- and I hope it won't be 60 years from now like New Mexico; it took 60 years to get in -- when they are admitted, they should have a partisan identification to effect their seniority and so forth on committees.

Now whether these are the ones we elect this year or whether they are the ones we elect some years from now, as elections will go on; I don't know when we are going to be admitted. The Dixon bill with Hilda's amendment provides for repeated elections to keep our in-house seats full from now to eternity, whether or not we are admitted.

So I would also say that I understand entirely the point of view of people who are concerned about the Hatch Act, but I think the solution to that is to change the Hatch Act not to make the elections non-partisan.

THE CHAIRMAN: Delegate Simmons.

DELEGATE SIMMONS: First of all, who is going to vote on whether or not our constitution is adequate and will become a state? The United States Congress, House and Senate, made up of Democrats and Republicans. Now why, if you are a Democrat or a Republican, would you want some neuter gender to be coming into your house? Why would you want statehood for someone who is not going to contribute to or add to whatever the ideology is that you represent?

Now no one in this room is unfamiliar with the old boy's network. There are some men this day that have jobs simply because they belong to the same fraternity that the guy who hired them belongs to. Whether or not you are available to see people, to hear what they have to say, many times has to do with some extraneous factor of association, relationship, all kinds of things.

Now all Senators and all Congressmen are busy people. None of them are sitting around waiting for delegates from the District of Columbia to come and occupy their day. And if they are busy, tell me what priority and preferential treatment we can expect in their busy day to see someone from the District talking about being a neuter and we want to sell you this idea so that we can come and sit in the aisle

of the Congress because we won't be Democrats and we won't be Republicans, we are going to be something in between. I think that that is not reality based and, as noble and worthy as the arguments for non-partisan may be, it is not in this reality. And I think you've got to deal with the universe of reality that we are talking about.

The District of Columbia has been an anonymity all of its life. We have talked about being the last colony; we have talked about second, third, fourth class citizenship; we've talked about having to bow to the whim of others who determine our destiny and then when we have an opportunity to be the architects, we create for ourselves some other anonymity called a neuter gender. We ain't Republicans and we ain't Democrats; we're something in between.

Now I don't think that that is -- that is part of the acculturation that happens to people. It's called societizing and we have been so long something other than straight first-class regular anythings that we can't even perceive when we have the pen in our hand, we can't even draw ourselves as whole human beings with full rights, full respect and full activity in the reality of this day and age.

And I think that we aren't at fault. We are the victims of that acculturation. But all I'm asking you for is

to shake out of it. Imagine that you are free; imagine that you are honest-to-goodness first-class citizens; pretend that you have been liberated and that there is nothing binding your mind and let's deal with the document that is creditable and therefore it can be sold. But it can't be sold if you can't get an audience and the audience to whom we are trying to get appeal once ratified are Democrats. Make no mistake about it and Republicans. Make no mistake about it. And I think that is a reality that I would hope we would consider.

Thank you.

(Applause.)

THE CHAIRMAN: The previous question has been moved. Those in favor of cutting off the debate, signify by saying aye.

(A chorus of "ayes".)

THE CHAIRMAN: Those opposed.

(A chorus of "nays".)

(Simultaneous discussion.)

THE CHAIRMAN: Those in favor, signify by raising their hands.

(Show of hands.)

THE CHAIRMAN: This vote is on in favor of cutting off debate. Okay, those in favor of cutting off debate on

this motion proposed by Delegate Corn, raise your hands.

(Show of hands.)

DELEGATE COOPER: Thirteen.

THE CHAIRMAN: Those opposed.

(Show of hands.)

DELEGATE COOPER: Eleven.

THE CHAIRMAN: The motion carries.

DELEGATE KAMENY: Point of order. That takes a two-third majority.

THE CHAIRMAN: Give me that vote again.

DELEGATE COOPER: Thirteen in favor; eleven against.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. There is not two-thirds.

Delegate Rothschild.

DELEGATE ROTHSCHILD: What delegate moved to call the question? What delegate was duly recognized to move to call the question?

THE CHAIRMAN: Delegate Blount moved to call the question.

Let me restate the motion. The motion is a substitute motion by Delegate Corn and that is to have non-partisan elections. All right, those in favor of Delegate Corn's motion --

(Simultaneous discussion.)

DELEGATE HARRIS: We haven't cut off the debate; we have to go back to the discussion.

THE CHAIRMAN: The motion to cut off debate failed, so we are back to additional discussion.

Delegate Feely, Delegate Rothschild.

DELEGATE FEELY: Delegate Feely, Ward 4.

I rise in support of non-partisanship. The reason why I do that is that I have listened to the arguments on both sides. Based on the job that I think needs to be done, I think that non-partisan people can do that job. With all due respect to our illustrious school board member, I would like to say that the school board election is supposed to be a non-partisan election.

The reason why I'm using the school board as an example is indeed, if you have not gotten the okay from the powers in the party, you aren't allowed to do certain kinds of things. I know from experience.

It seems to me then that with a non-partisan election the people should go to the Congress in a non-partisan capacity, can fill the talent, the know-how, the connection of all the people in the city. And there are indeed many, many people who have connections on the Hill who can help get the job done.

I hope that you will support non-partisanship.

THE CHAIRMAN: Rothschild.

DELEGATE ROTHSCHILD: Rothschild, Ward 2.

Let me just preface it by saying that part of our job is to have the patience to fully debate the issues before regardless of the time it takes. But if we lose that patience, we are not doing our job properly.

In regards to the issue specifically, I'm not sure that partisan elections in any way necessarily benefit anything. They are just labels. One delegate spoke to the fact of what reality exists. I think we are approaching times in the history of this city which is to become a state in this nation and this world when there are many different realities to consider. And I think that there is a lot to be gained by a non-partisan election in even setting a precedent and saying this is the way we do our politics. So I don't think we should be scared continually, even as we write this constitution, as to what the reality is out there. There are many realities and new realities are going to be taking place and we shouldn't be afraid to be part of that.

So I'm in favor of a non-partisan election. Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Delegate Bruning.

DELEGATE BRUNING: I also would like to speak in favor of non-partisan for the people that we elect in this interim period. I think we gain a great deal by having somebody that at least has the perception of being connected with neither party to take some of the edge off the fight as to whether this is indeed going to be a Republican person or a Democratic person, take some of that partisanship out.

I think we should make no mistake about it, when we become a state, which I think is the important question of what happens to these people when we become a state, let there be no mistake about it, these people will not be sitting out there as independents. They will immediately in essence organize themselves with either the Democratic or the Republican caucus, just like Harry Byrd does. Harry Byrd is an independent/Democrat. He could just as easily go and join the Republicans and he has been urged to do that; he doesn't.

By non-partisanship first we gain the advantage of the appearance of even-handedness in our delegates and, indeed, they cannot be attacked as Democrats or Republicans because they are independent. So make no mistake about it, when the politics comes down in which they can achieve and do something because we are now a state, they will be on one side or the other and they will have the impact of any

senator. So I think we gain both ways.

Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Brian Moore.

Delegate Coates. I just want to make an announcement here. After Coates, in order to continue discussion we have to vote on that again. And let me say something else: We have a proposed agenda. I recognize that this is an important issue and this expresses the opinions of the delegates. We have had 13 persons speaking on this motion for and against. Your agenda now has some other things that I think you consider important and that is revised staff arrangements. From time to time we get complaints about the kinds of service you get from staff. You've got some new ones and we have engaged ten secretaries, one for each one of the committees. There is a need for a parliamentarian whom we have yet to get and an editor yet. The operating committees have to report -- Style and Drafting and Rules and Calendar. The convention secretary has to report and there are all those long drawn-out committee reports and we have to find out who is prepared to start reading on Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday and Friday of next week. Those are also important.

So I would hope that after this that we will be prepared to move to complete the rest of the agenda.

DELEGATE BRIAN MOORE: I came into this hearing this afternoon undecided about whether the election should be partisan or non-partisan, and I must admit that I'm still in that position. I really don't know which way to go, whether it should be partisan or non-partisan. So I would like to ask the chair what would be the problem of tabling this petition until later on, if there is one?

THE CHAIRMAN: I think that would be a problem. The Mayor is going to make a recommendation to council; the council is making a recommendation too itself; the General Counsel of the Board of Elections is making a recommendation, and we wouldn't want all of that to be under consideration without having expressed a desire. I assume that that is going to have some impact on the City Council also. So it seems to me we should make an expression of how we feel. That legislation could be passed, as I understand, any time.

DELEGATE BRIAN MOORE: So I would hope that there would be more speakers. It would enlighten me on it.

THE CHAIRMAN: Delegate Coates.

DELEGATE COATES: Delegate Coates, Delegate from Ward 8.

Thank you, Mr. President. I think in this microcosm, we see some of the issues that will be debated in the macrocosm when our legislation goes before the Hill. But this

singular issue here is not the only one which I suggest might be typical of that larger forum. For example, there are rural states whose representatives might not want seats in the Congress -- that is, in the House or in the Senate -- representatives or senators from urban areas such as D.C. is. I submit that if we want to erase the policy label, then let's declare that Washington, D.C. is not an urban center but a rural center, if we think it takes that to gain some support.

I don't think, Mr. President, that we can undo the fact that Washington, D.C. is heavily registered in the Democratic Party and I don't think that's inimical to anybody's interest here. We have seated in the D.C. City Council not only members of the Democratic Party and Republican Party, but we have members of the statehood party and others. So that instead of declaring ourselves an anomaly, as Delegate Simmons at large has indicated, we ought to unabashedly, without apology, set forth what is and has been the tradition across this land and certainly it ought to be typical of this city -- let's declare ourselves partisan and run on that basis and leave the choices to the good deliberation and decision of the electors in D.C.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. There have now been 15 speakers

on both sides. The question is being called again.

DELEGATE CORN: Point of order. The mover may speak last under the rules. I do request that.

THE CHAIRMAN: I'm sorry, but the question has been called and there is no rule that says the question cannot be called at any particular time.

Those in favor of cutting off debate --

DELEGATE COOPER: Point of order, Mr. President. You didn't recognize anybody to call the question. He just blurted it out and there were delegates with their hands up. You did not recognize them.

THE CHAIRMAN: No, I recognized him.

DELEGATE COOPER: No, you did not. He just blurted it out.

THE CHAIRMAN: Those in favor of cutting off the debate, signify by raising your hands.

(Show of hands.)

DELEGATE COOPER: Nineteen.

THE CHAIRMAN: Those opposed.

(Show of hands.)

THE CHAIRMAN: Six. That is two-thirds.

Those in favor of the substitute motion offered by Delegate Corn that the elections be non-partisan, signify by raising your hands.

(Show of hands.)

DELEGATE COOPER: Eight.

THE CHAIRMAN: Those opposed.

(Show of hands.)

DELEGATE COOPER: Nineteen.

THE CHAIRMAN: The motion loses. We are back to the original motion -- abstentions.

(Show of hands.)

THE CHAIRMAN: It looks like two.

DELEGATE CORN: What was the vote please?

DELEGATE COOPER: Eight in favor, nineteen against and two abstaining.

THE CHAIRMAN: The original motion was -- do you want to restate that motion?

DELEGATE HARRIS: That the elections be partisan.

THE CHAIRMAN: The original motion is that the elections be partisan. All those in favor of that motion, please signify by raising your hands.

The motion that we are voting on now is that the elections be partisan.

(Show of hands.)

THE CHAIRMAN: Those opposed.

(Show of hands.)

THE CHAIRMAN: Those opposed six. Abstain.

(Show of hands.)

DELEGATE COOPER: One.

THE CHAIRMAN: The motion carries.

Are you in abstention, Delegate Oulahan?

DELEGATE OULAHAN: No. I would like to move --

THE CHAIRMAN: No.

DELEGATE OULAHAN: May I ask a question, Mr. President?

THE CHAIRMAN: Is it germane to the --

DELEGATE OULAHAN: I am just as anxious as you through the rest of the agenda. I, therefore, have a motion to table which I believe will help to shortcut --

THE CHAIRMAN: There is a motion on the floor; it is not been tabled.

The revised staff arrangements: Last week we stated that we would respond to the need for improved services, especially as we move toward the reading of various proposals. If you will look at the second sheet -- let me just make an announcement then.

In order that during the reading of the articles that all the typing needed by delegates on the spur of the moment, that all copying needed by the delegates on the spur

of the moment, that all services from the staff be done as expeditiously as possible; we have a new arrangement which provides for us three persons whose job is to service exclusively the delegates who are reading the proposals from their committees -- three persons, and one person, Jan Emery (Phonetic) who is the liaison to the committee secretary. Each committee now has its own secretary who reports exclusively to the chairperson. Okay. That staff person also accepts any requests from the committee chairs for duplication of typed work. That person also fills out the appropriate form that gives the work to a second staff person who accepts it to be duplicated. That person also is to be assured that all secretaries to the committees have adequate supplies, and any other duties assigned to that person to assist in getting whatever you bring in done.

The second person collects the duplication work, the duplication requests from the staff person. That person also dispatches work from the duplicating service with deadlines in mind. The duplication service may be our own duplicator; it may mean duplication service a couple of blocks from here; it may be the District Building where they have been duplicating work for us and it may be the duplicating services which is available from a particular building which

has the service which is nearby and can turn out stuff rapidly. That person also devises check-off forms and places the appropriate materials in the delegates' boxes according to the schedules for the reading. What you ask for you get back in the time that you indicated that you needed.

The third person -- and these are people on our staff essentially to serve you -- is responsible for making sure that this auditorium is set up with all the necessary equipment that you need; that means pencils, pads, sound equipment and anything else. That person also will develop a notebook with the proper division markers for each delegate, with the name of their committee marked on them and that is for the first reading for easy reference, so that you have in that notebook the briefing books or the briefing information the research assistants are now providing for you and all of the background information regarding round tables and also summaries of the proposals themselves so that one can read those each night without having to devise an intention between what you are hearing and what you are trying to read. So there are pens, pencils and that sort of thing.

Now those three persons are there to make certain that the complaints that we have about slow turns and slow responses we don't have next week because we don't have time

to deal with them next week. We need them in place.

I would like to announce also that each of the ten substantive committees that will be reading their proposals have been assigned a secretary. The convention has hired ten secretaries, one to a committee. Each of those secretaries reports not to the Executive Director but directly to the committee chairperson. Those committee chairs who were at the meeting this morning of the Executive Committee and the chairpersons have received their assignments. Those who prefer to leave it to Monday will have their assignments, so that each of the committees now will have available to them a secretary exclusively for their needs. You will decide the way that you want them to serve you as far as hours are concerned.

Okay, Delegate Bruning.

DELEGATE BRUNING: We lack a quorum and I think we should wait until they get back into the room.

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, Delegate Bruning, we want to continue this meeting and complete it. Will you go ask them if they will come back in the room please?

DELEGATE BRUNING: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes.

DELEGATE ROTHSCHILD: What happened to Dean Lawson

who was selected to serve as parliamentarian?

THE CHAIRMAN: Dean Lawson is unable to be with us.

I would like to ask for the reports on the operating committees starting with Style and Drafting. Would somebody kindly get the people back in the room now?

Delegate Corn.

DELEGATE COOPER: Point of order. Mr. President, we have adopted an agenda and you are deviating from the agenda that was adopted today.

THE CHAIRMAN: Delegate Corn.

DELEGATE COOPER: Point of order. Mr. President, it's not time for the committee reports. That's not the next item on the agenda.

THE CHAIRMAN: Delegate Schrag, would you make the point as to why we are now adhering to our existing rules when we do not have a quorum?

DELEGATE COOPER: Mr. President, we adopted this agenda.

THE CHAIRMAN: You're out of order. I'm asking somebody to respond to your concern. Now I'm sure information is what you want, right?

DELEGATE COOPER: No, information is not what I want; justice is what I want. I know what this convention

adopted this morning.

THE CHAIRMAN: Delegate Schrag.

DELEGATE SCHRAG: Mr. President, as I understand it, the reason you have called on Delegate Corn is because the rules of this convention give priority to the reports of operating committees other than reports of second readings and they come ahead -- according to Rule 6.1, they come ahead of the report of the Secretary of the Convention and the other committee reports.

Now it is true that we have adopted an agenda that didn't have that listed on that. The reason that no motion was made to add this item to the agenda was that you gave prior assurances before the meeting that this item would be raised at this time and to avoid taking up all the delegates' time on the floor and making an extra record and so forth, there was no need to make this formal motion to change the agenda. Sorry that Secretary Cooper wasn't privy to those discussions but I can assure the Secretary that the calling of Delegate Corn to make her report at this time is in accordance with the convention's rule 6.1. It should have been on the agenda. It was a mere oversight, I'm sure, that it was not on the agenda.

DELEGATE COOPER: I'm glad that Delegate Schrag gave

that information because he pointed that you in fact did decide that without the consent of the body, Mr. President. Now when we set forth the agenda, it would have been very easy to just say we're going to amend the agenda to put those reports in here. That's my question: Why didn't we do that? And then all of a sudden you're not going to inform the body as to why we are deviating from what they adopted.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay, maybe we can remedy that. Let the President repeat that. I guess we can't change what has happened in the past.

The rules themselves list the order of events. Delegate Schrag pointed it out this morning and I don't see any great concern on the part of the convention. The President apologizes that he did not make everybody aware of the fact that we are making a correction to the past omission of that.

Delegate Corn, may I ask you to make your report.

DELEGATE THOMAS: Point of order, Mr. President.

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes.

DELEGATE THOMAS: I would like to speak to the Rules and Calendar Committee. For the last two Saturdays they haven't been able to have a quorum. And I would like to make a move that after Delegate Corn you give Delegate Robinson an opportunity to give his full report before the